THE 2009 STATE ENERGY EFFICIENCY SCORECARD

October 2009

Report Number E097

© American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy 529 14th Street, N.W., Suite 600, Washington, D.C. 20045 (202) 507-4000 phone, (202) 429-2248 fax, www.aceee.org

Table 11. States Scoring Methodology for Utility Financial Incentives

Criteria	Points
The legislature has approved or recommended decoupling and/or performance incentives but the use of a given mechanism has not yet been implemented.	
OR	0.5
Lost Revenue Recovery is in place for at least one electric and/or natural gas utility.	
Decoupling <u>or</u> performance incentives established for at least one electric or natural gas utility or non-utility organization (performance incentives only possibly apply to non-utility organizations that administer programs)	1
Both decoupling <u>and</u> performance incentives established for electric <u>or</u> natural gas utilities (or non-utility organizations)	
OR .	2
Decoupling <u>or</u> performance incentives established for both electric <u>and</u> natural gas utilities (or non-utility organizations).	
Decoupling and performance incentives established for both electric and natural gas utilities (or non-utility organizations).	3

Table 12. Utility Financial Incentives

		oupling mechanism)	Performance Incentives		4.1
State	Electricity	Natural Gas	Electricity	Natural Gas	Score
California	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	3
Connecticut	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	3
New York	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	. 3
Vermont	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	3
Wisconsin	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	3_
North Carolina	Yes^	Yes	Yes	No	2.5
Minnesota	Yes*	Yes*	Yes	Yes	2.5
Kentucky	Yes^	Yes^	Yes	Yes	2.5
Nevada	Yes^	Yes	Yes	Yes	2.5
Colorado	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	2.5
Massachusetts	Yes*	Yes*	Yes	Yes	2.5
Arizona	No	Yes	Yes	No	2
Oregon	Yes	Yes	No	No	2
Maryland	Yes	Yes	No	No	2
Idaho	Yes	No	Yes	No	2
Washington	No	Yes	Yes	No	2
New Hampshire	No	No	Yes	Yes	2
Rhode Island	No	No	Yes	Yes	2
Indiana	No	Yes~	Yes*	Yes*	2
Ohio	Yes^*	Yes^*	Yes	No	1.5
Hawaii	Yes*	Yes*	Yes	No	1.5
New Jersey	No	Yes~	No	No	1.5
Utah	Yes*	Yes	Yes*	Yes*	1.5

	Decoupling (or related mechanism)		Performance Incentives		
State	Electricity		Electricity	Per and the second	Score
Virginia	No	Yes	Yes*	No	1.5
South Carolina	Yes^	No	Yes	No ·	1.5
District of Columbia	Yes	No	Yes*	Yes*	1.5
Georgia	Yes^	No	Yes	No	1.5
Oklahoma	Yes^	No	Yes	No	1.5
Arkansas	No	Yes	No	No	1
Illinois	No	Yes	No	No	1
Wyoming	No	Yes	No	No	1
Texas	No	No	Yes	No	. 1
South Dakota	No	No	Yes	No	1
Montana	Yes^	Yes^	Yes*	Yes*	1
Missouri	No	Yes^	Yes*	No	1
Michigan	Yes*	Yes*	Yes*	Yes*	0.5
Kansas	No	No	Yes*	Yes*	0.5
Florida	No	No	Yes*	Yes*	0.5
New Mexico	Yes*	Yes*	Yes*	Yes*	0.5
Delaware	Yes*	Yes*	No	No	0.5
Maine	Yes*	No	Yes*	No	0.5
Alabama	No	No	No	No	0
Alaska	No	No .	No	No	0
lowa	No	No	No	No	0
Louisiana	No	No	No	No	0
Mississippi	No	No	No	No	0
Nebraska	No	No .	No	No	0
North Dakota	No	No	No	No	0
Pennsylvania	No	No	No	No	0
Tennessee	No	No	No	No	0
West Virginia	No	No	No	No No	0

^{*} Decoupling for electric or gas utilities, or both, or performance incentives are authorized according to legislation or commission order but are not yet implemented.

[^] No decoupling, but some other mechanism for lost revenue adjustment.

[~] Both decoupling and a lost revenue adjustment mechanism are utilized.

Sources: Kushler, York, and Witte (2006); RAP (2008); AGA (2008); NRDC (2009a); IEE (2009a, 2009b); Lesh (2009)